arXiv:1603.04564v1 [cs.IT] 15 Mar 2016

Problems of Information Transmission,
vol. 51, no. 4, pp. 3-22, 2015.

M. V. Burnashev

ON RELIABILITY FUNCTION OF BSC: EXPANDING THE REGION, WHERE IT IS KNOWN EXACTLY [1]

The region of rates ("straight-line"), where the BSC reliability function is known exactly, is expanded.

§ 1. Introduction and main results

In the paper notation from [1] is used. A binary symmetric channel (BSC) with crossover probability $0 < p < 1/2$ and $q = 1 - p$ is considered. Let F^n denote the set of all 2^n binary n-tuples, and $d(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y})$, $\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y} \in F^n$ denote the Hamming distance between $\boldsymbol{x}$ and $\boldsymbol{y}$. A subset $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}(M, n) = \{\boldsymbol{x}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{x}_M\} \subseteq F^n$ is called a *code of length* n and *cardinality* M. The *minimum distance* of the code $\mathcal{C}$ is $d(\mathcal{C}) = \min\{d(\boldsymbol{x}_i, \boldsymbol{x}_j) : i \neq j\}$. Code rate is $R(\mathcal{C}) = n^{-1} \log_2 M$. Everywhere below $\log z = \log_2 z$.

Cardinality of a set A is denoted by $|A|$. Code *spectrum* (*distance distribution*) $B(\mathcal{C}) = (B_0, B_1, \ldots, B_n)$ is the $(n+1)$–tuple with components

$$B_i = |\mathcal{C}|^{-1} \left|\{(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y}) : \boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y} \in \mathcal{C},\, d(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y}) = i\}\right|, \qquad i = 0, 1, \ldots, n. \tag{1}$$

In other words, B_i is average number of codewords $\boldsymbol{y}$ on the distance i from the codeword $\boldsymbol{x}$. Clearly, $B_0 + \ldots + B_n = |\mathcal{C}|$. The total number of ordered codepairs $\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y} \in \mathcal{C}$ with $d(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y}) = i$ equals $|\mathcal{C}| B_i$.

The BSC *reliability function* $E(R, p)$ is defined as follows [2, 3, 4]

$$E(R, p) = \limsup_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n}, \ln \frac{1}{P_e(R, n, p)},$$

where $P_e(R, n, p)$ – the minimal possible decoding error probability P_e for (n, R)–code.

Introduce the function [5]

$$G(\alpha, \tau) = 2\frac{\alpha(1-\alpha) - \tau(1-\tau)}{1 + 2\sqrt{\tau(1-\tau)}} = \frac{1}{2} - \sqrt{\tau(1-\tau)} - \frac{(1-2\alpha)^2}{2\left[1 + 2\sqrt{\tau(1-\tau)}\right]} \tag{2}$$

and define the function $\delta_{GV}(R) \leq 1/2$ (Gilbert- Varshamov bound) as

$$1 - R = h_2(\delta_{GV}(R)), \qquad 0 \leq R \leq 1, \tag{3}$$

[1] Supported in part by the Russian Foundation for Basic Research (project nos. 15-01-08051) and by Russian Scientific Foundation (project nos. 13-01-12458 офи_м2).

where $h_2(x) = -x\log_2 x - (1-x)\log_2(1-x)$.

Define the value $R = R(\alpha, \tau)$ by the formula

$$R = 1 - h_2(\alpha) + h_2(\tau), \qquad 0 \le \tau \le \alpha \le 1/2. \tag{4}$$

For $R \in (0,1)$ and $\alpha \in [\delta_{GV}(R), 1/2]$ introduce also values

$$\begin{gathered} \tau_R(\alpha) = h_2^{-1}\left(h_2(\alpha) - 1 + R\right) \le \alpha, \\ \omega_R(\alpha) = G(\alpha, \tau_R(\alpha)) \end{gathered} \tag{5}$$

and

$$\omega_R = \min_{\delta_{GV}(R) \le \alpha \le 1/2} \omega_R(\alpha) = \min\{G(\alpha,\tau) : h_2(\alpha) - h_2(\tau) = 1 - R\}. \tag{6}$$

The best known upperbound for the maximal relative code distance $\delta(R)$ (linear programming bound) has the form [5, 6]

$$\delta(R) \le \delta_{LP}(R) = \omega_R. \tag{7}$$

If $R \le R_0 \approx 0.30524$ (R_0 is defined in (28) and (29)), then minimum in the right-hand side of (6) is attained for $\alpha = 1/2$, and the formula (7) takes simple form [5, 6]

$$\delta_{LP}(R) = \omega_R = \frac{1}{2} - \sqrt{\tau(1-\tau)}, \qquad R = h_2(\tau). \tag{8}$$

Denote by α_R, τ_R optimal values of parameters α, τ в (6),i.e.

$$\omega_R = \omega_R(\alpha_R) = G(\alpha_R, \tau_R). \tag{9}$$

The function ω_R decreases monotonically for $R \in (0,1)$, and the function α_R does not increases in R.

Introduce critical rates $R_{\text{crit}}(p), R_1(p)$ and $R_2(p)$, beginning with well-known

$$R_{\text{crit}}(p) = 1 - h_2\left(\frac{\sqrt{p}}{\sqrt{p}+\sqrt{q}}\right). \tag{10}$$

The rate $R_1(p)$ was introduced in [1, формулы (6)]

$$R_1(p) = h_2(\tau_1(p)), \qquad \tau_1(p) = \frac{\left(1 - (4pq)^{1/4}\right)^2}{2(1+\sqrt{4pq})} \le \frac{1}{2}. \tag{11}$$

Introduce the important value

$$\omega_1(p) = \frac{2\sqrt{pq}}{1+2\sqrt{pq}} = G(1/2, \tau_1(p)), \qquad 0 \le p \le 1/2. \tag{12}$$

Note that the value $\omega_1(p)$ is defined by the condition $t_1(\omega) = t_2(\omega, p)$ (см. (58)).

Introduce the critical rate $R_2 = R_2(p)$ by the formula

$$\omega_{R_2} = \omega_1(p) = \frac{2\sqrt{pq}}{1+2\sqrt{pq}}, \qquad 0 < p < 1/2, \tag{13}$$

or, equivalently,

$$R_2(p) = 1 - \max_{\alpha,\tau}\{h_2(\alpha) - h_2(\tau) : G(\alpha,\tau) = \omega_1(p)\}. \tag{14}$$

In other words, $R_2(p)$ is the minimal rate for which it is possible to have $G(\alpha,\tau) = \omega_1(p)$. On the contrary, $R_1(p)$ is the maximal such rate (it corresponds to $\alpha = 1/2$). Functions $R = R_2(p)$ and $R = R_1(p)$ decreases monotonically in $p \in [0, 1/2]$.

Introduce the value $p_0 \approx 0,036587$ as the unique root of the equation $R_2(p) = R_1(p)$. If $p < p_0$, then in the optimizing value $\alpha < 1/2$. If $p \geq p_0$, then the optimizing value $\alpha = 1/2$ and $R_2(p) = R_1(p)$. We also have $R_2(0) = R_1(0) = 1$ and $R_2(p_0) = R_1(p_0) = R_0 \approx 0.30524$, where R_0 is defined in (28)–(29).

Introduce also the value $p_1 \approx 0,0078176$ as the unique root of the equation $R_1(p) = R_{\rm crit}(p)$. Then we have

$$\begin{gathered} R_2(p) < R_{\rm crit}(p), \quad 0 < p < 1/2; \\ R_0 < R_2(p) < R_1(p), \quad p < p_0; \qquad R_2(p) = R_1(p) < R_0, \quad p > p_0; \\ R_1(p) < R_{\rm crit}(p), \quad p > p_1; \qquad R_1(p) > R_{\rm crit}(p), \quad p < p_1; \\ R_{\rm crit}(p) \leq R_0, \quad p \geq 0,05014. \end{gathered} \tag{15}$$

In Fig. 1 plots of functions $R_1(p)$, $R_2(p)$, $R_{\rm crit}(p)$ and $C(p)$ are shown.

Remark 1. Although notations $\omega_R(\alpha)$ and $\omega_1(p)$ (also $\tau_R(\alpha)$ and $\tau_1(p)$) are not well consistent, it should not imply any problems (for example, we always have $R < 1$).

In the region $R_{\rm crit}(p) \leq R \leq C(p) = 1 - h_2(p)$ the function $E(R,p)$ is known since a long time ago [2] and it coincides with the sphere-packing bound

$$E(R,p) = E_{\rm sp}(R,p), \qquad R_{\rm crit}(p) \leq R \leq C(p), \tag{16}$$

where

$$\begin{gathered} E_{\rm sp}(R,p) = D\left(\delta_{GV}(R)\|p\right), \qquad D(x\|y) = x\log\frac{x}{y} + (1-x)\log\frac{1-x}{1-y}, \\ E_{\rm sp}(0,p) = \frac{1}{2}\log\frac{1}{4pq} = 2E(0,p). \end{gathered} \tag{17}$$

The main result of the paper is

T h e o r e m 1. 1) *For any* $0 < p < 1/2$ *the inequality holds*

$$E(R,p) = 1 - \log_2\left(1 + 2\sqrt{pq}\right) - R, \qquad R_2(p) \leq R \leq R_{\rm crit}(p), \tag{18}$$

where $R_2(p), R_{\rm crit}(p)$ *are defined in* (13) *and* (10)*, respectively.*

2) *For any* $0 < p < 1/2$ *and* $0 \le R \le \min\{R_0, R_2(p)\}$ *the bound is valid*

$$E(R,p) \le \frac{\omega_R}{2}\log\frac{1}{4pq} - \mu(R,1/2,\omega_R) = \frac{\omega_R}{2}\log\frac{1}{4pq} - h_2(\tau) - h_2(\omega_R) + 1,$$
$$\omega_R = \frac{1}{2} - \sqrt{\tau(1-\tau)}, \qquad R = h_2(\tau), \tag{19}$$

where ω_R *u* $\mu(R,1/2,\omega)$ *are defined in* (6) *and* (33)*, respectively.*

3) *If* $p < p_0 \approx 0,036587$*, then* $R_0 < R_2(p)$ *and for* $R_0 \le R \le R_2(p)$ *the bound holds*

$$E(R,p) \le 1 + \min_{0\le\alpha\le 1/2}\left\{\frac{G(\alpha,\tau)}{2}\log\frac{1}{4pq} - L(G(\alpha,\tau))\right\} - R \le$$
$$\le 1 - R + \frac{\omega_R}{2}\log\frac{1}{4pq} - L(\omega_R), \tag{20}$$

where ($t_1(\omega)$ *is defined in* (58))

$$L(\omega) = 2h_2\left[t_1(\omega)\right] - \omega - (1-\omega)h_2\left[\frac{2t_1(\omega)-\omega}{2(1-\omega)}\right]. \tag{21}$$

In other words, for any $0 < p < 1/2$ the function $E(R,p)$ is linear for $R_2(p) \le R \le R_{\rm crit}(p)$. Earlier it was known only for $R_1(p) \le R \le R_{\rm crit}(p)$, if p is not too small [7, 1]. Recall that $R_2(p) < R_1(p)$, $p < p_0$, and $R_2(p) = R_1(p)$, $p \ge p_0$. Also $R_2(p) \le \min\{R_1(p), R_{\rm crit}(p)\}$, $0 < p < 1/2$ (see also (15)).

Notice also that improvement in the formula (18) with respect to [1] is attained due to using the values $\alpha < 1/2$ (in [1] only $\alpha = 1/2$ was used).

Inequalities (19)–(20) strengthen similar estimate form [1, теорема 1].

For comparison purpose, the best know lowerbound for $E(R,p)$ has the form [4]

$$E(R,p) \ge -\delta_{GV}(R)\log(2\sqrt{pq}), \qquad 0 \le R \le R_{\min}(p), \tag{22}$$

and

$$E(R,p) \ge 1 - \log_2(1 + 2\sqrt{pq}) - R, \qquad R_{\min}(p) \le R \le R_{\rm crit}(p), \tag{23}$$

where $\delta_{GV}(R)$ is defined in (4),

$$R_{\min}(p) = 1 - h_2\left(\frac{2\sqrt{pq}}{1+2\sqrt{pq}}\right), \tag{24}$$

and $R_{\min}(p) < R_2(p) < R_{\rm crit}(p)$, $0 < p < 1/2$.

Denote by $E_{\rm up}(R,p)$ the right-hand sides of formulas (18)–(20), and by $E_{\rm low}(R,p)$ the right-hand sides of formulas (22)–(23). Then for all R, p we have

$$E_{\rm low}(R,p) \le E(R,p) \le E_{\rm up}(R,p).$$

In Fig. 2 plots of functions $E_{\rm low}(R,p)$ and $E_{\rm up}(R,p)$ for $p = 0,01$ are shown. In that case $R_{\rm crit} \approx 0,5591$, $R_1 \approx 0,5518$, $R_2 \approx 0,5370$, $R_{\min} \approx 0,3516$, $C \approx 0,9192$.

Notice that $E_{\rm up}(R,p) - E_{\rm low}(R,p) > 0$ for $R < R_2(p)$ and all p.

Upper bounds (19) and (20) have simple meaning: we should apply the union bound using the best known upperbound (7) for the value $\delta(R)$ and the best known lowerbound (26) for the number of code neighbors.

When proving Theorem 1 we will need the function [9]:

$$\begin{gathered}\mu(R,\alpha,\omega) = h_2(\alpha) - 2\int\limits_0^{\omega/2} \log\frac{P+\sqrt{P^2-4Qy^2}}{Q}\,dy - (1-\omega)h_2\left(\frac{\alpha-\omega/2}{1-\omega}\right),\\ P = P(y) = \alpha(1-\alpha) - \tau(1-\tau) - y(1-2y),\\ Q = Q(y) = (\alpha-y)(1-\alpha-y) = \frac{(1-2y)^2-(1-2\alpha)^2}{4},\end{gathered} \tag{25}$$

where $\tau \le 1/2$ such that $h_2(\tau) = h_2(\alpha) - 1 + R$.

Importance of the function $\mu(R,\alpha,\omega)$ and its relation to the code spectrum $\{B_i\}$ (see (1)) is described by the following variant [9, Theorem 5] (see also proof in [1]).

T h e o r e m 2. *For any (R,n)–code and any $\alpha \in [\delta_{GV}(R), 1/2]$ there exists ω, $0 \le \omega \le G(\alpha,\tau)$, where $h_2(\tau) = h_2(\alpha) - 1 + R$ and $G(\alpha,\tau)$ is defined in* (2)*, such that*

$$\frac{1}{n}\log B_{\omega n} \ge \mu(R,\alpha,\omega) + o(1), \qquad n\to\infty, \tag{26}$$

where $\mu(R,\alpha,\omega) > 0$ is defined in (25) *and for $\mu(R,\alpha,\omega)$ the nonintegral representation* (82) *holds.*

It should be noted that the parameter α determines a constant weight αn code, which replaces the original code (using Elias-Bassalygo lemma) [5, 9, 1].

For $0 \le R \le R_0$ the best in Theorem 2 is $\alpha = 1/2$ [8, Remark 4], since such α simultaneously minimizes $G(\alpha,\tau)$ and maximizes $\mu(R,\alpha,\omega)$ for all ω. For $R > R_0$, probably, the optimal is $\alpha = \alpha_R$ (see (9)), i.e. minimization of $G(\alpha,\tau)$ over $\alpha < 1/2$ (at least, the value $G(\alpha,\tau)$ is in the estimate (20)). With $\alpha = \alpha_R$ we get from Theorem 2

C o r o l l a r y 1. *For any (R,n)–code there exists ω, $0 \le \omega \le \omega_R$ such that*

$$\frac{1}{n}\log B_{\omega n} \ge \mu(R,\alpha_R,\omega) + o(1), \qquad n\to\infty, \tag{27}$$

where ω_R and α_R are defined in (6) *and* (9)*, respectively.*

Remark 2. Theorem 1 is based on the important feature of inequalities (26) and (27). Till 1999 the best upperbound for $E(R,p)$ followed from the best upperbound (7) for the maximal relative code distance $\delta(R) \le \omega_R$ [5]. From that point of view inequalities (26)–(27) do not improve the estimate (7), but it follows from them that $\mu(R,\alpha_R,\omega_R) > 0$. In other words, there are an exponential number of codewords on the minimal (or smaller) code distance $\omega_R n$. That "correction" on $\mu(R,\alpha_R,\omega_R)$ in inequalities (19)–(20), essentially, constitutes Theorem 1. Notice also that the randomly chosen ("typical") code has the spectrum $n^{-1}\log B_{\omega n} \approx h_2(\omega) - h_2(\delta_{GV}(R))$, $\omega \ge \delta_{GV}(R)$. It is possible to check

that for such code the maximal contribution (additive) to the decoding error probability P_e is given by "neighbors" on the distance $\omega_1(p)n$ (see (12)), from which the inequality (24) follows for all R, p.

Introduce the value R_0 by the formula [6, 8]

$$R_0 = h_2(\tau_0) \approx 0,30524, \tag{28}$$

where $\tau_0 \approx 0,054507$ – the unique root of the equation

$$(1-2\tau)\left[1+\frac{1}{2\sqrt{\tau(1-\tau)}}\right] - \ln\frac{1-\tau}{\tau} = 0. \tag{29}$$

For fixed R we have

$$\frac{dG}{d\alpha} = \frac{2(1-2\alpha)}{1+2\sqrt{\tau(1-\tau)}} - \frac{(1-2\tau)}{2\sqrt{\tau(1-\tau)}}\left[1-\frac{(1-2\alpha)^2}{\left(1+2\sqrt{\tau(1-\tau)}\right)^2}\right]\frac{\ln[(1-\alpha)/\alpha]}{\ln[(1-\tau)/\tau]}. \tag{30}$$

For any R and $0 < \omega < G(\alpha, \tau)$ we also have [8, Proposition 1]

$$\mu'_\alpha(R, \alpha, \omega) > 0, \qquad \delta_{GV}(R) \le \alpha < 1/2.$$

For $R \le R_0$ the function $G(\alpha, \tau_R(\alpha))$ monotonically decreases in $\alpha \in [\delta_{GV}(R), 1/2]$ and $\alpha_R = 1/2$. If $R \in (R_0, 1)$ then values $0 < \tau_R < \alpha_R < 1/2$ are uniquely defined by the system of equations

$$\frac{dG}{d\alpha} = 0, \tag{31}$$

$$h_2(\alpha) - h_2(\tau) = 1 - R. \tag{32}$$

Also

$$\tau_R = \frac{1}{2}\left\{1 - \sqrt{1-\left[\sqrt{(1-\omega_R)^2-(1-2\alpha)^2}-\omega_R\right]^2}\right\}.$$

For $\alpha \in (0, 1/2)$ denote by $\tau(\alpha)$ the unique root of the equation (31), such that $\tau(\alpha) < \alpha$. Denote also $R(\alpha) = 1 - h_2(\alpha) + h_2(\tau(\alpha)),\ \alpha \in (0, 1/2)$.

The function $\tau(\alpha)$ monotonically increases, and $R(\alpha)$ monotonically decreases on α. Each $\alpha \in (0, 1/2)$ defines $R(\alpha) > R_0$ and $\tau(\alpha) < \alpha$. Similarly, each $R > R_0$ uniquely defines $\alpha < 1/2$ and $\tau(\alpha) < \alpha$. Note that

$$\lim_{\alpha\uparrow 1/2}\tau(\alpha) = \tau_0 \approx 0,0545, \quad \lim_{\alpha\uparrow 1/2} R(\alpha) = R_0 \approx 0,305, \quad \lim_{\alpha\uparrow 1/2} p(\alpha) = p_0 \approx 0,036587.$$

For calculation purpose it is convenient first to set the parameter $\alpha \in (0, 1/2)$, and then find sequentially corresponding values $\tau(\alpha), R(\alpha)$ from (31), (32) and $\omega(\alpha) = G(\alpha, \tau(\alpha))$. For $p = p(\alpha)$ (from (13)) we have $R_2(p) = R(\alpha)$ and

$$p(\alpha) = \frac{1-G-\sqrt{1-2G}}{2(1-G)}, \qquad G = G(\alpha, \tau(\alpha)).$$

In particular, for $\alpha \to 0$ we have

$$\tau \approx \alpha^2, \quad G(\alpha, \tau(\alpha)) \approx \alpha, \quad p(\alpha) \approx \frac{\alpha^2}{4}, \quad C(p(\alpha)) \approx 1 - \frac{\alpha^2}{2} \log \frac{1}{\alpha},$$
$$R_2(p(\alpha)) \approx 1 - \alpha \log \frac{1}{\alpha}, \quad R_{\text{crit}}(p(\alpha)) \approx 1 - \frac{\alpha}{2} \log \frac{1}{\alpha}.$$

Notice that due to Theorem 2 for a chosen α there exists ω such that $n^{-1} \log B_{\omega n} \geq \mu(R, \alpha, \omega) + o(1)$. In other words, the number of neighbors on the distance ωn for each codeword $\boldsymbol{x}_i$ satisfies *in average* that lowerbound. In fact, that property holds not only *in average*, but also for *every* codeword $\boldsymbol{x}_i$ from an "essential" part of all M codewords (i.e. for $Me^{o(n)}$, $n \to \infty$ codewords). That fact, established by the "cleaning procedure", regularly was used in the papers [10, 8, 1] (and earlier) and will be also used in the proof of Theorem 1.

Remark 3. In the author's paper [1] there are the following inaccuracies:

3a) There is a miscalculation in the formula (15) [1] for the function $\mu(R, 1/2, \omega)$, coming from the earlier paper [8, formula (23)]. The correct version of that formula is [8, формула (23)]. Правильный вид этой формулы

$$\begin{gathered}\mu(R, 1/2, \omega) = -2(1-\omega)\log(1-\omega) - \log\tau - 2(1-\tau)\log(1-\tau) + \\ +(1-2\tau)\log(\tau - \omega + g) + \log[1 - \omega - (1-2\tau)g] - 2\omega \log g - 2,\end{gathered} \tag{33}$$

where

$$\tau = \tau(R) = h_2^{-1}(R), \qquad g = g(\tau, \omega) = \frac{1 - 2\tau + \sqrt{(1-2\tau)^2 - 4\omega(1-\omega)}}{2}.$$

From (33) the useful formula, which has already appeared in [1, formula (16)], follows

$$\mu(h_2(\tau), 1/2, G(1/2, \tau)) = h_2(\tau) + h_2(G(1/2, \tau)) - 1, \qquad \tau \geq 0. \tag{34}$$

Due to importance of the formula (34), in Appendix its derivation is presented. In §4 the explicit (non-integral) representation for the function $\mu(R, \alpha, \omega)$ is obtained, from which the formula (33) can be received as well. There also the generalization of the formula (34) for arbitrary α is obtained (see (75)).

2b) There is the following inaccuracy in the formulation of Theorem 1 [1]: the function $W(\omega, \alpha, R, p)$ was defined, using the value $t_2(\omega, p)$ (for all ω). In fact, the proof of Theorem 1 in [1] was performed using the right function $t(\omega, p)$ (and for that purpose the function $t(\omega, p)$ was introduced in [1, formula (29)]). Due to the author's fault, the definition [1, formula (9)]) (coming from the earlier paper [8]) remained in [1, §1]. Those changes do not influence validity of the corollary 1 [1].

2c) There is an inaccuracy in the proof of the Theorem 1 (noted by Litsyn S., for which the author is grateful to him): the "cleaning" procedure in [1, §4] was performed in such a way that formally [1, формула (44)] does not yet follow from [1, формула

(41)]. The same drawback remained in [14] as well. In §2 below we fix that inaccuracy, and, moreover, simplify the proof.

2d) The main difference of the paper with respect to [8] is that here it turned out possible to investigate the case $\alpha < 1/2$. An important role was played by the relation (75). Also some proof details were simplified.

In §2 connection between $P_{\rm e}$ and a code spectrum is investigated. In §3 the proof of Theorem 1 is given. In §4 the non-integral representation for $\mu(R, \alpha, \omega)$ is derived. That representation is used in the proof of Theorem 1 in §3. Some calculations and proofs are presented in Appendix.

§ 2. Lower bound for $P_{\rm e}$ and code spectrum

For $\boldsymbol{x}_i \in \mathcal{C}$ denote $d_i(\boldsymbol{y}) = d(\boldsymbol{x}_i, \boldsymbol{y})$ and for any integer tn, $t \in (0, 1)$, introduce the set

$$\mathbf{X}_t(\boldsymbol{y}) = \{\boldsymbol{x}_i \in \mathcal{C} : d_i(\boldsymbol{y}) = tn\} = (\mathcal{C} + \boldsymbol{y})^{(tn)}, \qquad \boldsymbol{y} \in F^n.$$

Also for any integer tn, $t \in (0, 1)$ and each pair of codewords $\boldsymbol{x}_i \neq \boldsymbol{x}_j$ in the output space F^n of the channel introduce the "ambiguity" set:

$$\mathbf{Y}_{ij}(t) = \mathbf{Y}_{ji}(t) = \{\boldsymbol{y} : d_i(\boldsymbol{y}) = d_j(\boldsymbol{y}) = tn\}$$

and for $i = 1, \ldots, M$ the set

$$\mathbf{Y}_i(t) = \bigcup_{j \neq i} \mathbf{Y}_{ij}(t) = \{\boldsymbol{y} : \text{there exists } \boldsymbol{x}_j \neq \boldsymbol{x}_i, \text{ such that } d_i(\boldsymbol{y}) = d_j(\boldsymbol{y}) = tn\}.$$

Next result is a variant of [1, Proposition 2, formulas (20), (21)] (see also [8, лемма 2]).

L e m m a 1. *For error probability P_e the lower bound holds* ($t = m/n$)

$$P_e \geq \frac{q^n}{2M} \sum_{m=1}^{n} \left(\frac{p}{q}\right)^m \sum_{\boldsymbol{y}: |\mathbf{X}_t(\boldsymbol{y})| \geq 2} |\mathbf{X}_t(\boldsymbol{y})| = \frac{q^n}{2M} \sum_{m=1}^{n} \left(\frac{p}{q}\right)^m \sum_{i=1}^{M} |\mathbf{Y}_i(t)|. \tag{35}$$

P r o o f. We explain only the equality in the formula (35) (it was not done in [1]). It is sufficient to check the relation

$$\sum_{\boldsymbol{y}: |\mathbf{X}_t(\boldsymbol{y})| \geq 2} |\mathbf{X}_t(\boldsymbol{y})| = \sum_{i=1}^{M} |\mathbf{Y}_i(t)|, \qquad t = m/n > 0.$$

For any point $\boldsymbol{y}$ with $|\mathbf{X}_t(\boldsymbol{y})| \geq 2$ those $|\mathbf{X}_t(\boldsymbol{y})|$ codewords $\{\boldsymbol{x}_i\}$ give the same contribution $|\mathbf{X}_t(\boldsymbol{y})|$ to the right-hand side of the equality. □

Since

$$\sum_{\boldsymbol{y}: |\mathbf{X}_t(\boldsymbol{y})| \geq 2} |\mathbf{X}_t(\boldsymbol{y})| = \sum_{\boldsymbol{y}} |\mathbf{X}_t(\boldsymbol{y})| - \sum_{\boldsymbol{y}: |\mathbf{X}_t(\boldsymbol{y})| = 1} |\mathbf{X}_t(\boldsymbol{y})| =$$

$$= M\binom{n}{tn} - |\{\boldsymbol{y} : |\mathbf{X}_t(\boldsymbol{y})| = 1\}|,$$

then, in particular, from (35) for any $t \in (0,1)$ we have

$$P_{\rm e} \geq \frac{q^n}{2M} \left(\frac{p}{q}\right)^{tn} \left[M \binom{n}{tn} - |\{\boldsymbol{y} : |\mathbf{X}_t(\boldsymbol{y})| \geq 1\}| \right]. \tag{36}$$

Using the inequality $|\{\boldsymbol{y} : |\mathbf{X}_t(\boldsymbol{y})| \geq 1\}| \leq 2^n$ and optimizing over t, we get from (36) the sphere-packing bound (see [1, §3])

$$E(R,p) \leq E_{\rm sp}(R,p), \qquad 0 \leq R \leq C(p), \tag{37}$$

where $E_{\rm sp}(R,p)$ is defined in (17). From the inequality (37) and similar lowerbound [2] we get the formula (16). In other words, for $R \geq R_{\rm crit}(p)$ the lowerbound (35) for P_e is logarithmically precise.

Important for us will be the following result, similar to Johnson's bound [11, Theorems 17.2.2 and 17.2.4] (see proof in Appendix).

L e m m a 2. *Let $\mathcal{C} = \{\boldsymbol{x}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{x}_M\}$ – code of length n and constant weight tn, $t \leq 1/2$. If for some $\omega < 1/2$ and some $\delta \geq 0$ the following condition is fulfilled*

$$\sum_{0<i<\omega n} B_i \leq \delta M, \tag{38}$$

and for some $a > 0$ the value t satisfies the inequality

$$t \leq \frac{1 - \sqrt{1 - 2(1-\delta)\omega + 2a}}{2}, \tag{39}$$

then

$$M \leq \frac{\omega}{a}. \tag{40}$$

In the sequel Lemma 2 will be used for small δ, a. Then (39) takes the form (see the definition of the value $t_1(\omega)$ in (58))

$$t \leq (1 - \sqrt{1-2\omega})/2 + o(1), \qquad n \to \infty.$$

Consider some values related to sums in the right-hand side of (35). For codewords $\boldsymbol{x}_i, \boldsymbol{x}_j$ with $d_{ij} = d(\boldsymbol{x}_i, \boldsymbol{x}_j) = \omega n$ introduce the set

$$\mathbf{Z}_{ij}(t,\omega) = \{\boldsymbol{y} : d_i(\boldsymbol{y}) = d_j(\boldsymbol{y}) = tn\}. \tag{41}$$

Since the cardinality $|\mathbf{Z}_{ij}(t,\omega)|$ does not depend on indices (i,j), denote it simply $Z(t,\omega)$. For the value $Z(t,\omega)$, $\omega/2 \leq t \leq 1/2$ we have

$$\begin{gathered} \frac{1}{n}\log_2 Z(t,\omega) = \frac{1}{n}\log_2 \left[\binom{(1-\omega)n}{(t-\omega/2)n} \binom{\omega n}{\omega n/2} \right] = u(t,\omega) - \delta(t,\omega), \\ u(t,\omega) = \omega + (1-\omega) h_2\left(\frac{2t-\omega}{2(1-\omega)}\right), \\ 0 \leq \delta(t,\omega) \leq \frac{2}{n}\log_2 \frac{n+2}{2}, \end{gathered} \tag{42}$$

since for any $0 \le k \le n$ inequalities hold [12, formula (12.40)]

$$\frac{1}{n+1}2^{nh(k/n)} \le \binom{n}{k} \le 2^{nh(k/n)}.$$

For the function $u(t,\omega)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} u'_\omega &= -\frac{1}{2}\log\frac{(1-\omega)^2}{(2t-\omega)(2-2t-\omega)} \le 0, \\ u''_{\omega\omega} &= -\frac{(1-2t)^2}{(1-\omega)(2t-\omega)(2-2t-\omega)\ln 2} \le 0, \\ u'_t &= \log\frac{2-2t-\omega}{2t-\omega} \ge 0, \qquad t \le \frac{1}{2}, \\ u''_{tt} &= \frac{4(1-\omega)}{(2t-\omega)(2-2t-\omega)\ln 2} \le 0. \end{aligned} \tag{43}$$

We call $(\boldsymbol{x}_i, \boldsymbol{x}_j)$ ω–pair, if $d_{ij} = \omega n$. Then the total number of ω–pairs in a code equals $MB_{\omega n}$. We say that a point $\boldsymbol{y}$ is (ω, t)–covered, if there exists ω–pair $(\boldsymbol{x}_i, \boldsymbol{x}_j)$ such that $d_i(\boldsymbol{y}) = d_j(\boldsymbol{y}) = tn$. For the point $\boldsymbol{y}$ denote by $K(\boldsymbol{y}, \omega, t)$ the number of her (ω, t)–coverings (taking into account multiplicity of coverings), i.e.

$$K(\boldsymbol{y}, \omega, t) = |\,\{(\boldsymbol{x}_i, \boldsymbol{x}_j) : d_{ij} = \omega n,\, d_i(\boldsymbol{y}) = d_j(\boldsymbol{y}) = tn\}\,|, \qquad \omega > 0. \tag{44}$$

Then for any $t, \boldsymbol{y}$

$$|\mathbf{X}_t(\boldsymbol{y})|\,(|\mathbf{X}_t(\boldsymbol{y})| - 1) = \sum_{\omega>0} K(\boldsymbol{y}, \omega, t),$$

and for any t, ω we get

$$|\mathbf{X}_t(\boldsymbol{y})| \ge \sqrt{K(\boldsymbol{y}, \omega, t)}. \tag{45}$$

Therefore from (35) and (45) for any t, ω we have

$$P_e \ge \frac{q^n}{2M}\left(\frac{p}{q}\right)^{tn} \sum_{\boldsymbol{y}\in\mathbf{Y}} \sqrt{K(\boldsymbol{y}, \omega, t)}. \tag{46}$$

We modify the right-hand side of (46) as follows. For any set $\mathcal{A}$ denote

$$K(\mathcal{A}, \omega, t) = \sum_{\boldsymbol{y}\in\mathcal{A}} K(\boldsymbol{y}, \omega, t), \tag{47}$$

where $K(\boldsymbol{y}, \omega, t)$ is defined in (44). In other words, $K(\mathcal{A}, \omega, t)$ is the total number of (ω, t)–coverings of the set $\mathcal{A}$.

Introduce the set $\mathbf{Y}(\omega, t)$ of all (ω, t)–covered points $\boldsymbol{y}$, i.e.

$$\mathbf{Y}(\omega, t) = \{\boldsymbol{y} : K(\boldsymbol{y}, \omega, t) \ge 1\} = \left\{\boldsymbol{y} : \begin{array}{c} \text{there exist } \boldsymbol{x}_i, \boldsymbol{x}_j, \text{ such that} \\ d_{ij} = \omega n \text{ and } d_i(\boldsymbol{y}) = d_j(\boldsymbol{y}) = tn \end{array}\right\}.$$

Since every ω–pair $(\boldsymbol{x}_i, \boldsymbol{x}_j)$ t-covers $Z(t,\omega)$ points $\boldsymbol{y}$, then

$$K(\mathbf{Y},\omega,t) = K(\mathbf{Y}(\omega,t),\omega,t) = MB_{\omega n}Z(t,\omega). \tag{48}$$

For any subset $\mathbf{Y}' \subseteq \mathbf{Y}(\omega,t)$ introduce the value

$$K_{\max}(\mathbf{Y}',\omega,t) = \max_{\boldsymbol{y}\in\mathbf{Y}'} K(\boldsymbol{y},\omega,t). \tag{49}$$

Then for any t,ω and $\mathbf{Y}' \subseteq \mathbf{Y}(\omega,t)$ из (46) we have

$$P_e \geq \frac{q^n}{2M}\left(\frac{p}{q}\right)^{tn} \frac{K(\mathbf{Y}',\omega,t)}{\sqrt{K_{\max}(\mathbf{Y}',\omega,t)}}. \tag{50}$$

Describe the scheme of proving Theorem 1 realized in the paper. Suppose that for chosen ω, t it is possible to choose also a set $\mathbf{Y}'(\omega,t) \subseteq \mathbf{Y}(\omega,t)$ such that the following two conditions are fulfilled:

$$K(\mathbf{Y}'(\omega,t),\omega,t) \geq 2^{o(n)}K(\mathbf{Y}(\omega,t),\omega,t), \qquad n\to\infty \tag{51}$$

and

$$K(\boldsymbol{y},\omega,t) \leq 2^{o(n)}, \qquad \boldsymbol{y}\in\mathbf{Y}'(\omega,t). \tag{52}$$

Then the inequality (50) can be continued as follows

$$P_{\mathrm{e}} \geq 2^{o(n)}q^n\left(\frac{p}{q}\right)^{tn} K(\mathbf{Y}(\omega,t),\omega,t) = 2^{o(n)}q^n\left(\frac{p}{q}\right)^{tn} B_{\omega n}Z(t,\omega). \tag{53}$$

Estimate (53) is the desired additive lowerbound for P_{e} (for values ω, t). After optimization of the right-hand side of (53) over ω, t Theorem 1 will be proved.

Remark 4. For a good code the value $K(\boldsymbol{y},\omega,t)$ in (52), probably, can not be exponential in n for an essential part of all points $\boldsymbol{y}$. In other words, for a good code it is unlikely that exponential number of codewords are more probable than the true codeword (!?).

We set some ω and $t = t(\omega)$. Due to (48) there exists a collection of M_ω points $\{\boldsymbol{y}_1,\ldots,\boldsymbol{y}_{M_\omega}\}$ such that

$$K(\boldsymbol{y}_i,\omega,t) \sim \frac{MB_{\omega n}Z(t,\omega)}{M_\omega}, \qquad i = 1,\ldots,M_\omega.$$

For that purpose it is sufficient to "quantize" all values $\ln K(\boldsymbol{y},\omega,t) \sim n$ with a step of order $o(n)$, $n\to\infty$. At that $K(\boldsymbol{y}_i,\omega,t)$ is the number of ω-pairs on the t-sphere around the point $\boldsymbol{y}_i$. The total number of various ω-pairs on t-spheres around points $\{\boldsymbol{y}_i\}$ has the order $MB_{\omega n}$, i.e. "all"(in exponential sense) ω-pairs are located on those spheres. Therefore each ω-pair belongs to $Z(t,\omega)$ t-spheres, i.e. it covers $Z(t,\omega)$ points $\boldsymbol{y}_i$. Then, essentially, each ω-pair covers only points $\boldsymbol{y}_i$.

If there are several such M_ω then choose the maximal one.

As a result, there are N_ω points on every t-sphere and each t-sphere there are $K(\boldsymbol{y}_i, \omega, t)$ ω-pairs. We investigate the right-hand side of the inequality (53). Denoting

$$b(\omega) = \frac{1}{n}\log B_{\omega n} + o(1), \qquad n \to \infty, \tag{54}$$

represent (53) in an equivalent form ($n \to \infty$)

$$\frac{1}{n}\log\frac{1}{P_e} \le c(\omega, t, p) - b(\omega) + o(1), \tag{55}$$

where

$$c(\omega, t, p) = t\log\frac{q}{p} - \log q - u(t, \omega), \tag{56}$$

and the function $u(t, \omega)$ is defined in (42). For the function $c(\omega, t, p)$ using (43) we have

$$\begin{gathered} c'_\omega = -u'_\omega = \frac{1}{2}\log\frac{(1-\omega)^2}{(2t-\omega)(2-2t-\omega)} \ge 0, \\ c''_{\omega\omega} = \frac{(1-2t)^2}{(1-\omega)(2t-\omega)(2-2t-\omega)\ln 2} \ge 0, \\ c'_t = \log\frac{q(2t-\omega)}{p(2-2t-\omega)} \le 0, \qquad t \le t_2(\omega, p) = \frac{\omega}{2} + (1-\omega)p, \\ c''_{tt} = \frac{4(1-\omega)}{(2t-\omega)(2-2t-\omega)\ln 2} \ge 0. \end{gathered} \tag{57}$$

The function $c(\omega, t, p)$ from (56) has a simple meaning. Suppose that we distinguish two codewords $\boldsymbol{x}_i, \boldsymbol{x}_j$ with $d(\boldsymbol{x}_i, \boldsymbol{x}_j) = \omega n$. Introduce the set of "ambiguity" $\mathbf{Z}_{ij}(t, \omega)$ from (41). If $\boldsymbol{y} \in \mathbf{Z}_{ij}(t, \omega)$ then with probability $1/2$ decoding error occurs. Moreover,

$$\mathbf{P}\left\{\boldsymbol{y} \in \mathbf{Z}_{ij}(t, \omega) | \boldsymbol{x}_i\right\} \sim 2^{-c(\omega, t, p)n}.$$

In order to choose the radius t introduce functions (see. [1, formula (29)])

$$t_1(\omega) = \frac{1 - \sqrt{1-2\omega}}{2}, \qquad t_2(\omega, p) = \frac{\omega}{2} + (1-\omega)p. \tag{58}$$

The function $t_2(\omega, p)$ sometimes is called "Elias radius". We set

$$t(\omega, p) = \min\{t_1(\omega), t_2(\omega, p)\} = \begin{cases} \left(1 - \sqrt{1-2\omega}\right)/2, & \omega \le \omega_1(p), \\ \omega/2 + (1-\omega)p, & \omega \ge \omega_1(p), \end{cases} \tag{59}$$

where $\omega_1(p)$ is defined in (12). The threshold value $\omega_1(p)$ will play very important role in the sequel.

It follows from (57) that the function $c(\omega, t, p)$ monotonically decreases in $t < t_2(\omega, p)$ and monotonically increases in $t > t_2(\omega, p)$. In particular,

$$\min_t c(\omega, t, p) = c(\omega, t_2(\omega, p), p) = \frac{\omega}{2} \log \frac{1}{4pq}. \tag{60}$$

For any ω we will alway choose t such that the following condition is satisfied

$$t \le t(\omega, p). \tag{61}$$

There are two reasons for such choice:

1) we would like to minimize the function $c(\omega, t, p)$, which monotonically decreases in $t < t_2(\omega, p)$;

2) the condition $t \le t_1(\omega)$ is necessary in order Lemma 2 be valid (and related with it the condition (52)).

§ 3. Proof of Theorem 1

For a given R choose some α such that $h_2^{-1}(1-R) \le \alpha \le 1/2$ (see Theorem 2) and set $\tau = h_2^{-1}(h_2(\alpha) - 1 + R)$ (such τ minimizes $G(\alpha, \tau)$). Due to Theorem 3 for some $\delta \le \delta_0 = G(\alpha, \tau)$ we have

$$\frac{1}{n} \log B_{\delta n} \ge \mu(R, \alpha, \delta) + o(1), \qquad n \to \infty.$$

Since $K(\mathbf{Y}, \delta, s(\delta)) = MB_{\delta n} Z(s(\delta), \delta)$ for any radius $s(\delta)$, there exists a collection of N_δ points $\{\boldsymbol{y}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{y}_{N_\delta}\}$ such that

$$K(\boldsymbol{y}_i, \delta, s(\delta)) = \frac{2^{o(n)} MB_{\delta n} Z(s(\delta), \delta)}{N_\delta}, \qquad i = 1, \dots, N_\delta.$$

Therefore from (46) we get

$$P_e \ge 2^{o(n)} \frac{q^n}{\sqrt{M}} \left(\frac{p}{q}\right)^{s(\delta)n} \sqrt{N_\delta B_{\delta n} Z(s(\delta), \delta)}. \tag{62}$$

Now two cases are possible:

1) $\ln K(\boldsymbol{y}_i, \delta, s(\delta)) = o(n)$ for an essential part N_δ of points $\{\boldsymbol{y}_i\}$ (i.t. the condition (52) is fulfilled);

2) $\ln K(\boldsymbol{y}_i, \delta, s(\delta)) \sim n$ for for an essential part N_δ of points $\{\boldsymbol{y}_i\}$.

Consider sequentially those cases assuming $s(\delta) \le t_1(\delta)$.

1) If $\ln K(\boldsymbol{y}_i, \delta, s(\delta)) = o(n)$ for an essential part N_δ of points $\{\boldsymbol{y}_i\}$, then the bound (62) takes additive form for δ and $t = s(\delta)$

$$P_{\mathrm{e}} \ge 2^{o(n)} q^n \left(\frac{p}{q}\right)^{s(\delta)n} B_{\delta n} Z(s(\delta), \delta). \tag{63}$$

2) If $\ln K(\boldsymbol{y}_i, \delta, s(\delta)) \sim n$ for an essential part N_δ of points $\{\boldsymbol{y}_i\}$, then consider $s(\delta)$-spheres around each point $\boldsymbol{y}_i$ from that essential part. We may assume that on every such $s(\delta)$-sphere there is the same number m_1 points and there are $K(\boldsymbol{y}_i, \delta, s(\delta))$ δ-pairs. Denote by $B'_{\omega n}$ analogues of numbers $B_{\omega n}$ for $s(\delta)$-spheres. Then

$$m_1 B'_{\delta n} = K(\boldsymbol{y}_i, \delta, s(\delta)) = \frac{2^{o(n)} M B_{\delta n} Z(s(\delta), \delta)}{N_\delta}.$$

Let for that essential part N_δ точек $\{\boldsymbol{y}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{y}_{N_\delta}\}$ the condition is satisfied

$$\sum_{\omega<\delta} K(\boldsymbol{y}_i, \omega, s(\delta)) \le K(\boldsymbol{y}_i, \delta, s(\delta))/n. \tag{64}$$

Since $s(\delta) \le t_1(\delta)$, it follows from Lemma 2 that the number points m_1 on every such $s(\delta)$-sphere satisfies the inequality (40), i.e. it is non-exponential. Therefore in that case the additive bound (63) holds.

It remains to consider the case when for some $\omega < \delta$ the condition (64) is not satisfied, i.e. for an essential part N_δ points $\{\boldsymbol{y}_i\}$

$$K(\boldsymbol{y}_i, \omega, s(\delta)) > K(\boldsymbol{y}_i, \delta, s(\delta))/n^2. \tag{65}$$

If necessary, choose the minimal one among all possible $\omega < \delta$. Then we have (since $K(\mathbf{Y}, \omega, s) = M B_{\omega n} Z(s, \omega)$)

$$\log\left[B_{\omega n} Z(s(\delta), \omega)\right] \ge \log\left[B_{\delta n} Z(s(\delta), \delta)\right] + o(n). \tag{66}$$

Therefore for an essential part N_δ of points $\{\boldsymbol{y}_i\}$ we have $\log B'_{\omega n} \ge \log B'_{\delta n} + o(n)$. We choose $s(\omega) \le t_1(\omega)$ such that the potential additive bound ω will be not less than the right-hand side of (63), i.e. the inequality holds

$$\left(\frac{p}{q}\right)^{s(\delta)n} B_{\delta n} Z(s(\delta), \delta) \le \left(\frac{p}{q}\right)^{s(\omega)n} B_{\omega n} Z(s(\omega), \omega). \tag{67}$$

Due to (66) for that purpose it is sufficient to have

$$\left(\frac{p}{q}\right)^{s(\delta)n} Z(s(\delta), \omega) \le \left(\frac{p}{q}\right)^{s(\omega)n} Z(s(\omega), \omega),$$

or, equivalently,

$$f = [s(\delta) - s(\omega)] \log \frac{q}{p} + u(s(\omega), \omega) - u(s(\delta), \omega) \ge 0, \tag{68}$$

where $u(t, \omega)$ is defined in (42). Using (43) we have

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial s(\omega)} = \log \frac{p[2 - 2s(\omega) - \omega]}{q[2s(\omega) - \omega]} \ge 0, \qquad s(\omega) \le t_2(p, \omega),$$
$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial s(\delta)} = \log \frac{q[2s(\delta) - \omega]}{p[2 - 2s(\delta) - \omega]} \ge 0, \qquad s(\delta) \ge t_2(p, \omega).$$

Therefore for all ω we set

$$s(\omega) = t(p, \omega) = \min\{t_1(\omega), t_2(p, \omega)\}.$$

Since $s(\omega) \le s(\delta)$, the inequalities (68) and (67) will be fulfilled. It means that a descent from δ to ω does not decreases the potential additive bound. It should be noted that a further descent from ω on a lower level ω_1 is not possible, since the level ω was chosen as the minimal possible one, for which the inequality (65) holds. It proves validity of the additive bound (63) for $s(\omega) = t(p, \omega)$, from which we get $(h_2(\tau) = h_2(\alpha) - 1 + R)$

P r o p o s i t i o n 1. *For any* $0 \le R < C(p)$ *and* $0 < p < 1/2$ *the inequality holds*

$$E(R, p) \le \min_{0 \le \alpha \le 1/2} \max_{\delta \le G(\alpha, \tau)} \left\{ t(p, \delta) \log \frac{q}{p} - \log q - \mu(R, \alpha, \delta) - u(t(p, \delta), \delta) \right\}. \qquad (69)$$

That result coincides with [1, Theorem 1] in the most interesting region $0 \le R \le R_2(p)$ and improves that Theorem in the less interesting region $R_2(p) \le R \le C(p)$.

Remark 5. For large R maximum over $\delta \le G(\alpha, \tau)$ in (69) is attained not in the extreme point $\delta = G(\alpha, \tau)$.

We will get the paper main Theorem 1 as a corollary from the bound (69). For that purpose introduce the function

$$W(\omega, \alpha, R, p) = \frac{\omega}{2} \log \frac{1}{4pq} - \mu(R, \alpha, \omega). \qquad (70)$$

As will be clear below, it is sufficient to consider the case $0 \le R \le R_2(p)$. Then $\min\limits_{0 \le \alpha \le 1/2} G(\alpha, \tau) \ge \omega_1(p)$ (see (6) and (13)) and then $t(p, \delta) = t_2(\delta, p)$. Since

$$u(t_2(\delta, p), \delta) = \delta + (1 - \delta) h_2(p),$$

then for $0 \le R \le R_2(p)$ we get from (69)

$$E(R, p) \le \min_{0 \le \alpha \le 1/2} \max_{\delta \le G(\alpha, \tau)} W(\delta, \alpha, R, p), \qquad (71)$$

where the function $W(\delta, \alpha, R, p)$ is defined in (70).

We show that maximum over δ in the right-hand side of (71) is attained for $\delta = G(\alpha, \tau)$.

L e m m a 3. *For any* $0 \le \tau \le \alpha \le 1/2$ *such that* $R = 1 - h_2(\alpha) + h_2(\tau)$ *and* $G(\alpha, \tau) \ge \omega_1(p)$ *the formula holds*

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{\lambda \le G(\alpha, \tau)} W(\lambda, \alpha, R, p) &= W(G(\alpha, \tau), \alpha, R, p) = \\ &= \frac{G(\alpha, \tau)}{2} \log \frac{1}{4pq} - \mu(R, \alpha, G(\alpha, \tau)). \end{aligned} \qquad (72)$$

P r o o f. From (25) we have [8, Proposition 1] ($P = P(\omega/2)$, $Q = Q(\omega/2)$, $a_1 = 2[\alpha(1-\alpha) - \tau(1-\tau)]$)

$$\mu'_\omega(R,\alpha,\omega) = \frac{1}{2}\log\frac{(1-\omega)^2}{(\alpha-\omega/2)(1-\alpha-\omega/2)} - \log\frac{P+\sqrt{P^2-Q\omega^2}}{Q} = \\ = \log\frac{(1-\omega)\sqrt{(2\alpha-\omega)(2-2\alpha-\omega)}}{a_1-\omega(1-\omega)+\sqrt{(1-2\tau)^2\omega^2-2a_1\omega+a_1^2}}, \\ \mu''_{\omega\omega}(R,\alpha,\omega) < 0. \tag{73}$$

For $W(\omega,\alpha,R,p)$ we have from (70) and (73) [8, Proposition 2]

$$W''_{\omega\omega}(\omega,\alpha,R,p) < 0, \qquad W'_\omega(\omega,\alpha,R,p)\Big|_{\omega=G} = \log\frac{G}{\sqrt{4pq}(1-G)}, \qquad G = G(\alpha,\tau).$$

Therefore, if $G(\alpha,\tau) \geq \omega_1(p)$ then $W'_\omega(\omega,\alpha,R,p)\Big|_{\omega=G} \geq 0$, and then maximum over δ in the right-hand side of (72) is attained for $\lambda = G(\alpha,\tau)$. $\square$

As a result, from (71) and (72) for $0 \leq R \leq R_2(p)$ we get

$$E(R,p) \leq \min_{0\leq\alpha\leq 1/2}\left\{\frac{G(\alpha,\tau)}{2}\log\frac{1}{4pq} - \mu(R,\alpha,G(\alpha,\tau))\right\}. \tag{74}$$

It remained us to get for $\mu(R,\alpha,G(\alpha,\tau))$ from (74) an explicit expression. We use the following analytical result (see proof in Appendix).

L e m m a 4. *For any α,τ the formula holds*

$$\mu(R,\alpha,G(\alpha,\tau)) = L(G(\alpha,\tau)) + R - 1, \tag{75}$$

where $R = 1 - h_2(\alpha) + h_2(\tau)$ and the function $L(\omega)$ is defined in (21).

Using (75) and (74) we get

П р е д л о ж е н и е 2. *For any $0 < p < 1/2$ and $0 \leq R \leq R_2(p)$ the bound holds*

$$E(R,p) \leq 1 - R + \min_{0\leq\alpha\leq 1/2}\left\{\frac{G(\alpha,\tau)}{2}\log\frac{1}{4pq} - L(G(\alpha,\tau))\right\} \leq \\ \leq 1 - R + \frac{\omega_R}{2}\log\frac{1}{4pq} - L(\omega_R), \tag{76}$$

where ω_R is defined in (6).

In particular, from (76) the formula (20) follows. Concerning the formula (19) recall that if $R \leq R_0$, then the best is $\alpha = 1/2$. The bound (19) follows from (74) with $\alpha = 1/2$ and (34).

It remained us to prove the formula (18). Note that

$$t_1(\omega_1(p)) = \frac{\sqrt{p}}{\sqrt{q}+\sqrt{p}}.$$

Therefore if $G(\alpha,\tau)=\omega_1(p)$ then using (75) we get

$$\mu(R,\alpha,\omega_1(p))=\frac{\omega_1(p)}{2}\log\frac{1}{4pq}+R+\log(1+2\sqrt{pq})-1. \tag{77}$$

Then for any rate R, for which it is possible to have $G(\alpha,\tau)=\omega_1(p)$, from (74) and (77) the inequality follows

$$E(R,p)\le 1-\log(1+2\sqrt{pq})-R. \tag{78}$$

The rate $R=R_2(p)$ is the minimal of such rates (see (13)). For $R=R_{\rm crit}(p)$ the formula holds [2] (see (16))

$$E\left(R_{\rm crit},p\right)=E_{\rm sp}\left(R_{\rm crit},p\right)=1-\log_2\left(1+2\sqrt{pq}\right)-R_{\rm crit}. \tag{79}$$

Therefore due to to the "straight-line upper bound" [3] the inequality (78) holds for all R such that $R_2(p)\le R\le R_{\rm crit}(p)$, i.e.

$$E(R,p)\le 1-\log(1+2\sqrt{pq})-R,\qquad R_2(p)\le R\le R_{\rm crit}(p). \tag{80}$$

On the other hand, for the function $E(R,p)$ the random coding lower bound is known [2]

$$E(R,p)\ge 1-\log_2\left(1+2\sqrt{pq}\right)-R,\qquad 0\le R\le R_{\rm crit}(p). \tag{81}$$

As result, from (80) and (81) the formula (18) follows, that completes Theorem 1 proof.

§ 4. Non-integral representation for $\mu(R,\alpha,\omega)$

Proof of the next result represents a standard integration using Euler's substitution. That representation is used in deriving the formula (75) and in the proof of Theorem 1.

P r o p o s i t i o n 3. *For the function $\mu(R,\alpha,\omega)$ the representation holds*

$$\mu(R,\alpha,\omega)=(1-\omega)h_2\left(\frac{\alpha-\omega/2}{1-\omega}\right)-h_2(\alpha)+2h_2(\omega)+\omega\log\frac{2\omega}{e}-T(A,B,\omega), \tag{82}$$

where

$$\begin{gathered}\tau=h_2^{-1}(h_2(\alpha)-1+R)\le 1/2,\\ A=1-2\alpha,\qquad B=1-2\tau,\qquad B>A\ge 0,\\ T(A,B,\omega)=\omega\log(v-1)-(1-\omega)\log\frac{v^2-A^2}{v^2-B^2}+\\ +B\log\frac{v+B}{v-B}-A\log\frac{v+A}{v-A}-\frac{(v-1)(B^2-A^2)}{(v^2-B^2)\ln 2},\end{gathered} \tag{83}$$

and

$$v=\frac{\sqrt{B^2\omega^2-2a_1\omega+a_1^2}+a_1}{\omega},\qquad a_1=2[\alpha(1-\alpha)-\tau(1-\tau)]. \tag{84}$$

P r o o f. Using notations (83) and the variable $z = 2y$, we have from (25)

$$\mu(R,\alpha,\omega) = h_2(\alpha) - \omega - (1-\omega)h_2\left(\frac{\alpha-\omega/2}{1-\omega}\right) - \int\limits_0^\omega \log\frac{f_1}{g_1}\,dz,$$

$$f_1 = z^2 - z + a_1 + \sqrt{B^2z^2 - 2a_1z + a_1^2}, \qquad g_1 = (1-z)^2 - A^2.$$

Then

$$\int\limits_0^\omega \log g_1\,dz = -2h_2(\alpha) - 2(1-\omega)\log(1-\omega) + 2(1-\omega)h_2\left(\frac{\alpha-\omega/2}{1-\omega}\right) - 2\omega\log\frac{e}{2}.$$

We also have

$$\int\limits_0^\omega \log f_1\,dz = F(a_1,B,\omega) - F(a_1,B,0),$$

where $F(a_1,B,z)$ – primitive function for $\log f_1$. In order to find $F(a_1,B,z)$, we use Euler's substitution

$$\sqrt{B^2z^2 - 2a_1z + a_1^2} = zv - a_1,$$

and then

$$z = \frac{2a_1(v-1)}{v^2-B^2}, \qquad z' = \frac{2a_1(2v-v^2-B^2)}{(v^2-B^2)^2}.$$

Now

$$F(a_1,B,z)\ln 2 = \int \ln f_1\,dz = z\ln z - z +$$

$$+z(v)\ln[z(v)+v-1] + \frac{a_1}{A}\ln\frac{v+A}{v-A} - 4a_1^2I_1,$$

where

$$I_1 = \int \frac{(2v-v^2-B^2)}{(v^2-A^2)(v^2-B^2)^2}\,dv.$$

After standard integration we have

$$(B^2-A^2)^2I_1 =$$

$$= \ln\frac{v^2-A^2}{v^2-B^2} + \frac{(v-1)(B^2-A^2)}{(v^2-B^2)} + \frac{(B^2+A^2)}{2A}\ln\frac{v+A}{v-A} + B\ln\frac{v-B}{v+B}.$$

Since $2a_1 = B^2 - A^2$ and

$$z(v) + v - 1 = \frac{(v-1)(v^2-A^2)}{v^2-B^2},$$

we get

$$F(a_1,B,z)=z\log z-\frac{z}{\ln 2}+z\log(v-1)-(1-z)\log\frac{v^2-A^2}{v^2-B^2}+$$
$$+B\log\frac{v+B}{v-B}-A\log\frac{v+A}{v-A}-\frac{(v-1)(B^2-A^2)}{(v^2-B^2)\ln 2},$$

where v is defined in (84). Since $v\to\infty$ as $u\to 0$ и $F(a,b,0)=0$, then

$$\mu(R,\alpha,\omega)=-h_2(\alpha)-2(1-\omega)\log(1-\omega)-2\omega\log e+$$
$$+(1-\omega)h_2\left(\frac{\alpha-\omega/2}{1-\omega}\right)-F(a_1,B,\omega),$$

from which Proposition 3 follows. $\square$

APPENDIX

P r o o f o f f o r m u l a (33). For $\omega\le G(1/2,\tau)$ we have [8, formula (П. 2)]

$$\mu(R,1/2,\omega)\ln 2=-2\omega(1-\ln 2)-2(1-\omega)\ln(1-\omega)-I,$$
$$I=\int\limits_0^{2\omega}\ln\left[b+\sqrt{(1-z)^2+b^2-1}\right]\,dz,\qquad b=1-2\tau>0.$$

In order to find the integral I, we use variable $u=\sqrt{(1-z)^2+b^2-1}$. Then denoting

$$A=\sqrt{(1-2\omega)^2+b^2-1},\qquad v_1=\frac{b}{\sqrt{1-b^2}},\qquad v_2=\frac{A}{\sqrt{1-b^2}},$$

and using integration by parts we have

$$I=-\int\limits_b^A\ln(b+u)\,d\sqrt{u^2+1-b^2}=$$
$$=\ln(2b)-(1-2\omega)\ln(b+A)+\sqrt{1-b^2}\int\limits_{v_1}^{v_2}\frac{\sqrt{1+v^2}}{v+v_1}\,dv.$$

Since

$$\int\frac{\sqrt{1+z^2}}{z+a}\,dz=$$
$$=\sqrt{1+z^2}-a\ln\left[z+\sqrt{1+z^2}\right]-\sqrt{1+a^2}\,\ln\frac{\sqrt{(1+a^2)(1+z^2)}-za+1}{z+a},$$

then

$$I=\ln(2b)-(1-2\omega)\ln(b+A)-2\omega-b\ln\frac{1-2\omega+A}{1+b}-\ln\frac{b(2-2\omega-b^2-bA)}{(b+A)(1-b^2)}.$$

After standard algebra with $g = (b + A)/2$ we get the formula (33). $\square$

P r o o f o f l e m m a 2. Consider a code $\mathcal{C}$ average distance

$$d_{\text{av}}(\mathcal{C}) = M^{-2} \sum_{i=1}^{M} \sum_{j=1}^{M} d_{ij}.$$

Similarly to Plotkin's bound derivation [11, теорема 2.2.1] we have

$$d_{\text{av}}(\mathcal{C}) \le 2t(1-t)n, \qquad 0 \le t \le 1. \tag{85}$$

Using the assumption (38) we can also lower bound the value $d_{\text{av}}(\mathcal{C})$

$$d_{\text{av}}(\mathcal{C}) \ge \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i \ge \omega n} i B_i \ge \frac{\omega n}{M} \sum_{i \ge \omega n} B_i =$$

$$= \frac{\omega n}{M} \left\{ \sum_{i>0} B_i - \sum_{0<i<\omega n} B_i \right\} \ge \frac{\omega(M - 1 - \delta M)n}{M}.$$

Comparing that estimate with (85) we get the inequality (40). $\square$

P r o o f o f f o r m u l a (75). We use the representation (82) and notations from (83) and (84). Since

$$G(\alpha, \tau) = \frac{a_1}{1 + 2\sqrt{\tau(1-\tau)}}, \qquad a_1 = 2[\alpha(1-\alpha) - \tau(1-\tau)],$$

then

$$B^2 G^2 - 2a_1 G + a_1^2 = 0 \qquad \text{и} \qquad v = \frac{a_1}{G} = 1 + 2\sqrt{\tau(1-\tau)}.$$

Also

$$v - B = 2\sqrt{\tau v}, \qquad v + B = 2\sqrt{(1-\tau)v},$$

$$v^2 - B^2 = 4\sqrt{\tau(1-\tau)} \left[1 + 2\sqrt{\tau(1-\tau)} \right], \qquad \frac{(v-1)(B^2 - A^2)}{v^2 - B^2} = G,$$

$$v - A = 2\left[\sqrt{\tau(1-\tau)} + \alpha \right], \qquad v + A = 2\left[1 + \sqrt{\tau(1-\tau)} - \alpha \right].$$

Therefore ($\omega = G(\alpha, \tau)$)

$$T(A, B, G) = \frac{\omega}{2} \log\left[\tau(1-\tau)\right] - (1-\omega) \log \frac{\left[1 + \sqrt{\tau(1-\tau)} - \alpha \right] \left[\sqrt{\tau(1-\tau)} + \alpha \right]}{\sqrt{\tau(1-\tau)} \left[1 + 2\sqrt{\tau(1-\tau)} \right]} +$$

$$+ \frac{(1-2\tau)}{2} \log \frac{1-\tau}{\tau} - (1-2\alpha) \log \frac{1 + \sqrt{\tau(1-\tau)} - \alpha}{\sqrt{\tau(1-\tau)} + \alpha} - \omega \left(\frac{1}{\ln 2} - 1 \right)$$

and

$$\mu(R,\alpha,G)=(1-\omega)h_2\left(\frac{\alpha-\omega/2}{1-\omega}\right)+R-1+2h_2(\omega)+\omega\log\omega+$$
$$+(1-\omega)\log\frac{\left[1+\sqrt{\tau(1-\tau)}-\alpha\right]\left[\sqrt{\tau(1-\tau)}+\alpha\right]}{\left[1+2\sqrt{\tau(1-\tau)}\right]}+$$
$$+(1-2\alpha)\log\frac{1+\sqrt{\tau(1-\tau)}-\alpha}{\sqrt{\tau(1-\tau)}+\alpha}.$$

Using in the last expression formulas

$$\frac{2\alpha-G}{2}=\frac{\left[\sqrt{\tau(1-\tau)}+\alpha\right]^2}{1+2\sqrt{\tau(1-\tau)}},$$
$$1-G-\frac{2\alpha-G}{2}=\frac{\left[1+\sqrt{\tau(1-\tau)}-\alpha\right]^2}{1+2\sqrt{\tau(1-\tau)}},$$

and also formulas

$$ah\,(b/a)=a\ln a-b\ln b-(a-b)\ln(a-b),$$
$$2t_1(\omega)-\omega=2t_1^2(\omega),$$

we get the formula (75). $\square$

REFERENCES

1. *Burnashev M. V.* Code spectrum and reliability function: binary symmetric channel // Probl. Inform. Transm. 2006. V. 42. № 4. P. 3–22.

2. *Elias P.* Coding for noisy channels // IRE Conv. Rec. 1955. March, P. 37–46. Reprinted in D. Slepian, Ed., Key papers in the development of information theory, IEEE Press, 1974, P. 102–111.

3. *Shannon C. E., Gallager R. G., Berlekamp E. R.* Lower Bounds to Error Probability for Codes on Discrete Memoryless Channels. I, II // Inform. and Control. 1967. V. 10. № 1. P. 65–103; № 5. P. 522–552.

4. *Gallager R.G.* A Simple Derivation of the Coding Theorem and some Applications // IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory. 1965. V. 11. P. 3–18.

5. *McEliece R. J., Rodemich E. R., Rumsey H., Jr., Welch L. R.* New Upper Bounds on the Rate of a Code via the Delsarte–MacWilliams Inequalities // IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory. 1977. V. 23. № 2. P. 157–166.

6. *Levenstein V. I.* On a straight line bound for the undetected error exponent // Probl. Inform. Transm. 1989. V. 25. № 1. P. 33–37.

7. *Barg A., McGregor A.* Distance Distribution of Binary Codes and the Error Probability of Decoding // IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory. 2005. V. 51. № 12. P. 4237–4246.

8. *Burnashev M. V.* Upper bound sharpening on reliability function of binary symmetric channel // Probl. Inform. Transm. 2005. V. 41. № 4. P. 3–22.

9. *Litsyn S.* New Bounds on Error Exponents // IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory. 1999. V. 45. No. 2. P. 385–398.

10. *Burnashev M. V.* On the relation between the code spectrum and the decoding error probability // Probl. Inform. Transm. 2000. V. 36. № 4. P. 3–24.

11. *MacWilliams F. J., Sloane N. J. A.* The Theory of Error-Correcting Codes. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: North Holland. 1977.

12. *Cover T. M., Thomas J. A.* Elements of Information Theory. New York: Wiley. 1991.

13. *Levenshtein V. I.* Bounds for packings of metric spaces and some applications // Probl. Kibern. M.: Nauka, 1983. V. 40. P. 43–110.

14. *Burnashev M. V.* Supplement to the paper: Code spectrum and reliability function: binary symmetric channel // Probl. Inform. Transm. 2007. V. 42. № 1. P. 28–31.

Burnashev Marat Valievich
Kharkevich Institute for Information Transmission Problems,
Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow
burn@iitp.ru



Fig. 1. Plots of functions $R_1(p), R_2(p), R_{\text{crit}}(p)$ and $C(p)$



Fig. 2. Plots of functions $E_{\text{low}}(R,p)$ and $E_{\text{up}}(R,p)$ for $p = 0,01$